Exhibit 89 to the Cobb Declaration

(Dkt. No. 316-5)

REDACTED

	Page 1
1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2	FOR THE WESTERN DIVISION OF WASHINGTON
3	AT SEATTLE
4	
5	
6	IN RE: VALVE ANTITRUST)
	LITIGATION)
7) No. 2:21-cv-00563-JCC
)
8	
9	
10	
11	HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY
12	
13	VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF LESLEY CHIOU, Ph.D.
14	Los Angeles, California
15	Tuesday, June 18, 2024
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	Reported by:
23	RENEE A. PACHECO, RPR, CLR
24	CSR No. 11564
25	

	Page 38
1	the overlap in titles, that is consistent with
2	evidence of demand substitution.
3	Q Microsoft has the Xbox; right?
4	A Yes, it does.
5	Q And Microsoft has the Xbox for Microsoft
6	Store on the Xbox; right?
7	A There is a Microsoft Store. There is also
8	a Microsoft Xbox app for P.C.
9	Q Okay. And on the Microsoft Xbox store or
10	the Xbox Microsoft Store, I should say, Microsoft
11	sells Xbox console versions of games; right?
12	A On the Microsoft Store on Xbox, they sell
13	console games. But Microsoft, as I discuss in my
14	report, has also begun merging the two stores for
15	P.C. and console. They now have a Xbox app for P.C.
16	and Play Anywhere titles where once a title is
17	purchased, it can be played either on a P.C. or on a
18	console.
19	Q Okay. Well, let's stick with my question,
20	though.
21	Microsoft historically has had the
22	Microsoft Store where it sells P.C. versions of its
23	games; right?
24	A Would you please clarify that question?
25	Q Yes.

	Page 39
1	On P.C.s, there is a Microsoft Store where
2	you can buy Microsoft games; right?
3	A Yes, there is a Microsoft Store on P.C.s,
4	and also one on Xbox.
5	Q To your understanding, does Microsoft pay a
6	commission to itself for sales of the games on the
7	Microsoft Store?
8	MR. CASPER: I object to the form of the
9	question.
10	THE DEPONENT: Would you please clarify
11	what you mean by "pay a commission to itself"?
12	BY MR. WOLFSON:
13	Q Does it charge itself a commission?
14	The answer is no; right?
15	MR. CASPER: Object to the form of the
16	question.
17	THE DEPONENT: Would you please restate the
18	question?
19	BY MR. WOLFSON:
20	Q Does Microsoft charge itself a commission?
21	A I believe that was the same question
22	earlier, so I'm not clear by what you mean by
23	"Microsoft charging itself."
24	I do talk about the different revenue share
25	rates across the different platforms.

THOREST CONTIDENTIAL ATTORNETS LIES ONES
Page 40
Q Does Microsoft, for its sales of Microsoft
games on the Microsoft Store, to the best of your
knowledge, deduct any amounts or commissions or any
other charges that Microsoft charges on the
Microsoft Store?
A For Microsoft's own titles, I'm not aware
of Microsoft charging or administering itself a
revenue share rate. Microsoft does, for example,
incur costs of distribution.
Q Now, Microsoft sells its games on Steam as
well; right?
A There's some overlap, yes
Q And
A in titles.
Q Sorry. I didn't mean to cut you off at the
end there.
But for any sale that Microsoft makes on
Valve's Steam store, it owes Valve a revenue share,
what we call the 30 percent commission; right?
A In exchange for services from Valve,
Microsoft does share revenue.
Q Okay. So on the Microsoft Store, it does
not share revenue, but for sales on the Steam store,
it does share revenue. It sells console games on

the Microsoft Store for no revenue share. It sells

	THE TENTE TO THE TOTAL TO THE TENTE TO THE T
	Page 41
1	P.C. games on Steam for a revenue share.
2	To you, is that evidence of
3	substitutability or complementary?
4	A Would you please be more specific in that
5	question? I'm not following the logic.
6	Q Yes.
7	The fact that Microsoft is selling console
8	games on a console store for no revenue share but is
9	still selling P.C. versions of those same games on
10	Valve for revenue share, does that indicate to you
11	that that substitute or that's evidence of
12	substitutability between consoles and P.C.s, or is
13	it evidence of complementary between consoles and
14	P.C.s?
15	A This is something that I discuss in my
16	report. It's evidence that there are a wide array
17	of alternative distribution options for Microsoft
18	and for other publishers.
19	It also shows that there are other features
20	that publishers care about when choosing different
21	platforms.
22	So certainly, these are options, these are
23	alternatives, and that's absolutely consistent with
24	substitution.

Professor Chiou, that wasn't my question.

Q

Page 42

My question is: With those facts, is that evidence to you of substitute between gaming consoles or P.C.s, or is it evidence of complementary between gaming consoles and P.C.s?

A My answer is as before. It's those are options and alternatives. So it's certainly consistent with substitution in which publishers can choose different alternatives to distribute their games.

Q Microsoft, one of the biggest gaming console manufacturers in the world, is making its games, it's making both console versions and P.C. versions.

To you, does that suggest substitutability between gaming consoles and P.C.s? Am I getting your testimony correct?

A Not quite.

What I discuss in my report is that there's substitution on the publisher side where they can choose between different platforms, and also on the consumer side as well too where they have options now of purchasing a title -- I have an exhibit on this popular title -- across these different platforms. So that is consistent with alternatives in substitution.

	Page 43
1	Q Well, if you look at Paragraph 44 of your
2	opinion, on the top of Page 26, you say (as read):
3	"Many platforms are available
4	only on specific devices, so the
5	device a consumer selects to play
6	video games on dictates the
7	platforms available to them. In
8	particular, console devices use
9	proprietary operating systems that
10	integrate the device with the
11	platform, which excludes other
12	platforms from participating."
13	Did I read that correctly?
14	A Yes, you did.
15	One moment while I finish reading.
16	I'm done reading.
17	Q Is that still your opinion?
18	A Yes, this is what I wrote.
19	Q Can you access Steam on an Xbox?
20	A So Steam can be accessed through a variety
21	of ways, through the P.C. or the Steam Deck.
22	Through an Xbox machine, it cannot be accessed.
23	However, something that I discuss, and it's
24	also discussed in the plaintiffs' reports, is that
25	consumers multi-own, they own multiple devices, so

	Page 44
1	they have an option to select titles across the
2	different platforms.
3	They also have an option, even before they
4	select a device, over what type of platform they
5	want to choose through their selection.
6	Q Okay. So a consumer might view a gaming
7	console or a a P.C. as a substitute, but just
8	because a consumer something can be substituted
9	for a consumer, can't it also be a complement for a
10	publisher?
11	A Well, what I discuss here in my report is
12	that there is direct evidence of substitution for
13	publishers across different platforms.
14	I also point out, in Dr. Schwartz's report,
15	that he does not rule out that multi-homing, having
16	access to different platforms is doesn't rule out
17	that as substitutes and, in fact, it can be, and
18	it's consistent with the evidence.
19	Q Can an Xbox user access Steam or the Epic
20	Games Store for Xbox games?
21	A If an Xbox user has a P.C. and, for
22	example, has Steam, then yes, an Xbox user can.
23	Q That was not my question.
24	Can an Xbox user access Steam to get Xbox
25	games, Xbox console versions of games?

	Page 45
1	A An Xbox well, sorry. Can you please
2	repeat the question?
3	Q Yeah.
4	Can an Xbox user use Steam or Epic Games
5	Store to get a game for their Xbox?
6	A They can use those platforms to get a
7	popular title that's also available on Xbox, but not
8	the Xbox version. However, those are similar the
9	same titles are often offered on both.
10	Q On Steam, can well, strike that.
11	Now, what about a a Xbox user? Can they
12	use the Microsoft Store to get a PlayStation game?
13	A An Xbox user can use the Microsoft Store to
14	get titles that are often also available on
15	PlayStation. This is one of my exhibits.
16	Q So you're saying that if a game is made
17	available across different types of stores, and if
18	the consumer has different types of devices, they
19	might have options of getting a game on P.C. versus
20	a gaming console; right?
21	A I'm saying something a little bit more
22	broad, which is that there are different titles
23	available across different platforms. If a consumer
24	happens to own multiple devices, they have that
25	choice.

Page 46
Even if a consumer doesn't, they also have
a choice over selecting platform, selecting a
device, and selecting a title from the beginning.
Q And all of this you're saying indicates
only substitutability, or is it your opinion that
none of this indicates or could indicate
complementary?
A What I'm saying is that this, as well as
the other evidence that I look at indicates is
completely consistent with substitutability.
What I say in my report is that
Dr. Schwartz claims that there is this
multi-homing leads to complementary, but he does not
rule that out. And my assignment is focused on
looking at Dr. Schwartz's methodologies.
Q Here is my question: Are you saying that
gaming consoles are substitutes for P.C. gaming?
A I'm saying that the evidence is consistent
with gaming consoles and P.C.s being substitutes.
I go further and talk in the other section
about how Dr. Schwartz omits these important
substitutes.
Q But my question is a little bit it's a
finer point.

Is it your opinion that gaming consoles are

	Page 221
1	Q Yep. And that would be \$30 under this
2	scenario; right?
3	A Under this scenario, the publisher
4	Q Yes. That's 30 percent of \$100; correct?
5	A So yeah, that would be a cost that a
6	publisher would bear.
7	Q Okay. So if I want to look at what they
8	the total costs in revenue share to distribution
9	platforms for these games, I would have to include
10	the \$30 paid to Valve, plus the \$30 paid to the
11	<pre>competing platform; correct?</pre>
12	A If we're looking at the publisher's
13	yeah, if you're looking at the publisher's rate
14	revenue share rate, including what they're paying to
15	the competing platforms, then yes, there is there
16	is a cost to that.
17	Q Okay. So that would be 30 plus 30 is the
18	<pre>numerator, 60; right?</pre>
19	A Yeah, I agree 30 plus 30 is 60, but it's
20	not Valve's portion.
21	Q I get that. But then, if we're looking at
22	the revenue generated in Steam sales and Steam keys
23	sales, the dominator would be 100 plus 100; right?
24	A Yes.
25	Q Okay. Which would mean that the actual

	Page 222
1	revenue share paid by the publisher is 30 percent;
2	correct?
3	A Yes. If we're looking at the publisher and
4	how they split their share with the Steam key
5	reseller, yes.
6	Q Okay. Great.
7	If I could have that, I'm going to write in
8	30 percent here.
9	Okay. Did I write 30 in the right spot
10	there?
11	A But these two formulas here are calculating
12	two different things.
13	Q Right. Now, I want you to assume
14	something. Assume, using all these facts that we
15	just talked about, or hypothetical ones, assume that
16	Valve charged 25 percent instead of 30 percent, and
17	that you are also looking at the revenue share,
18	including that that the publisher is paying to
19	the competing platform, you would agree with me that
20	its actual revenue share would drop from 30 percent
21	to 27.5 percent?
22	A So let's see. So you said the Valve
23	revenue share rate would drop. So that percentage
24	drop, assuming that there's the same revenue that
25	would be computed, yeah, in the numerator.

	Page 223
1	Q Okay. It would pay less money over all if
2	Valve dropped its commission; right?
3	A According to this hypothetical, yes.
4	Q Okay. Now, let's let's look at a
5	different world. All right?
6	MR. WOLFSON: Let's mark this as 4, please.
7	(Plaintiffs' Exhibit 4 was marked
8	for identification.)
9	BY MR. WOLFSON:
10	Q Now, let's assume a world with no Steam
11	keys, but a world with lower commissions. All
12	right?
13	So here, I have got your formula, but the
14	assumptions are Valve's commission is 20 percent.
15	There's 100 revenues \$100 in revenue from sales
16	on Steam. And then there's a competing platform
17	that also charges 20 percent. And there's \$100 in
18	publisher revenue on that competing platform, but
19	there's no Steam keys. It's just \$100 in revenue on
20	that platform. Okay? Those are the assumptions I
21	want you to make.
22	Now, am I right that using your formula
23	under these assumptions and again, it's publisher
24	revenue, pre-revenue share, et cetera that using
25	your formula, the effective revenue share for this

Page 224 1 publisher would be 20 percent; right? 2 Α Yes, in this scenario. 3 If you don't mind, can I have Exhibit 4? 4 I'll write that. 5 Now, I know that the -- you do not have a formula for a world with no Steam keys. But if this 7 publisher is paying a competing platform 20 percent 8 on \$100 in revenue for non-Steam key versions of its 9 game, its actual revenue share paid across Steam 10 sales and competing platform sales would also be 20 percent; right? 20 plus 20 on the numerator, 100 11 12 plus 100 on the denominator? 13 Across both. Α 14 Q Okay. If you don't mind. 15 Now, looking at the actual revenue share 16 paid by publisher numbers on -- on Exhibits 2 and 4, 17 you would agree with me that a world in which Valve 18 has a lower commission than today benefits the 19 publisher; right? 20 So looking at this particular hypothetical 21 here, there is -- the effective revenue share rate 22 changes from 15 percent to 20 percent. 23 I didn't ask about that. I asked about the 24 actual revenue share rate. Let's look -- so you 25 agree that in the world -- first of all, in Scenario

	Page 225
1	1, Exhibit 2, in the scenario where only Valve
2	lowered its commission, its revenue share, and the
3	competing platform did not, that the actual amount
4	of revenue share that the publisher pays is less;
5	right?
6	A Across the two platforms, yes.
7	Q And you would agree that in a world where
8	Valve and the competing platform both charge lower
9	commission rates, the actual revenue share number
10	this is Scenario 2, Exhibit 4 is lower for the
11	<pre>publisher; right?</pre>
12	A Yeah, in this hypothetical, yes.
13	Q Okay. Thank you.
14	You can set those aside.
15	You said before that percent you're
16	aware of percent of game publishers utilizing
17	Steam keys?
18	A I said that that was Dr. Schwartz's
19	estimate of the number of publishers that check the
20	checkboxes on the Steam key request form.
21	Q Okay. Did you see anything or did you
22	see any data that indicates that that number is
23	wrong?
24	A The data that I saw indicated that
25	publishers vary widely in their use of keys.

Page 226

	1.490 120
1	Q Have you any reason to doubt that
2	percent of the publishers have used Steam keys?
3	A So Steam keys do vary in their usage. What
4	I talk about in my report is that Dr. Schwartz
5	mishandles the processing of the keys.
6	So what I'm saying in in reference to
7	the percent is that he is using that in one way
8	as evidence of this classwide or common knowledge.
9	And what I'm saying is even given that,
10	that is not common knowledge, and also, I do a
11	direct test with actual data.
12	Q If percent of game publishers were aware
13	that Valve has a checkbox requirement that they
14	cannot price Steam key games lower than on on
15	Steam store, it's your opinion that there is not
16	widespread knowledge of this requirement?
17	A So the evidence is inconsistent with there
18	being any alleged price parity. As far as the
19	percent, those are the ones that check the
20	checkboxes.
21	According to Dr. Schwartz, what I describe
22	in my report is it varies of the according to
23	Dr. Schwartz, how many read the key request form,
24	how did they interpret it, did it ultimately change
25	their actions.

	Page 227
1	Q You're you're aware that Valve's
2	Software Development Agreement, the SDA, indicates
3	that Steam keys are not subject to Valve's revenue
4	share; right?
5	A Are you referring to the SDA?
6	Q Yeah.
7	A The Standard Distribution Agreement?
8	Q Standard Distribution Agreement, yes.
9	A Okay. Yeah, sorry, would you please repeat
10	the question again?
11	Q Yeah. It's it says that Steam keys are
12	not subject to Valve's revenue share?
13	A That Steam keys are not subject to revenue
14	share? Publishers don't pay a revenue share for
15	that.
16	Q Okay. And Valve's aware that the amount of
17	Steam keys issued and redeemed varies by game and
18	and publisher; right?
19	A Issuances and redemptions, yes, vary.
20	Q Okay. And the the pricing rules don't
21	vary depending on the amount of Steam keys issued
22	and redeemed; right?
23	A Which pricing rules are you referring to?
24	I have no there is no evidence of any alleged
25	pricing parity.

	Page 228
1	Q I'm sorry. The revenue share rules, they
2	don't vary based on how many Steam keys are issued
3	or redeemed by you, right, as a publisher?
4	A The effective revenue share rate does vary.
5	Q That's not what I asked.
6	I said the revenue for Steam key
7	Steam sales on Steam, that doesn't raise or lower
8	depending on how many Steam keys sell and redeems or
9	it gets in the first place; right?
10	A Can you repeat that again, the last part?
11	Q Yeah. Valve doesn't say, If you get more
12	Steam keys, you owe us more in terms of revenue
13	share; right?
14	A The revenue share is 0 percent for Steam
15	keys.
16	Q That's not what I was asking.
17	For games sold on Steam, on the Steam
18	store, Valve does not say, Well, if you get so many
19	Steam keys and redeem them, then you're going to owe
20	us a higher revenue share, right, for games sold on
21	the Steam store?
22	A Oh, I see what you're saying. The nominal
23	rate is independent of the keys.
24	Q Okay. Now, if Valve well, when Valve
25	changed to its its structured tiers, it didn't

Page 242 the -- we talked about the indirect network effects of Valve's two-sided platform and the features it offers publishers. Some publishers might like some of the features Valve offers. Some might not care about those features; right? Α So I would say there's a difference, yes, in the features and how they're valued by publishers. Okay. Q Α And that, in general, Steam is more feature-rich. Q Okay. So Steam, by being feature-rich, that's one of the ways it competes; right? A It competes on quality. Okay. Now, if Steam were to keep all those same features, its competitors were to keep all the same features, but the only difference is that Steam -- or that Valve dropped its revenue share, wouldn't you agree that publishers selling on Steam are all going to benefit in terms of paying Valve less money? So I believe this is a similar question to Α what was asked before, in which you said to keep the features constant and to drop the rate. And my response there was that by dropping the rate, may

1

2

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

	Page 243
1	not be able to keep the existing features.
2	But in general, consumers or publishers,
3	they do care about price, and they also care about
4	features.
5	Q And you haven't done any analysis showing
6	that had Valve dropped its commission even a decade
7	ago, that they would have been unable to introduce
8	or maintain the features it has today; right?
9	A Well, my assignment is to assess
10	Dr. Schwartz's methodology and his determination of
11	what would happen with price and features in the
12	but-for world.
13	Q He he concluded, actually, that Valve
14	could have dropped its commission and increased its
15	innovation, didn't he?
16	A Dr. Schwartz assumed that. He did not show
17	why that would be the case. He also did not
18	establish any with any common-wide evidence how
19	the value of the quality adjusted rates would affect
20	each publisher.
21	Q Well, we have already agreed, Professor
22	Chiou, that each publisher inherently has a
23	different value for Valve's services; right?
24	A Yeah, they vary in their benefits.
25	Q Okay. Are you saying that there's no world

	Page 244
1	in which we could show that that publishers would
2	benefit on the whole from a lower from paying
3	Valve less, just because they value Valve's services
4	slightly differently?
5	MR. CASPER: Object to the form of the
6	question.
7	THE DEPONENT: So what I'm saying is that
8	in this but-for world, there are new entrants.
9	Everyone will all the platforms will be choosing
10	prices and features, and that each publisher, then,
11	would have their own preferences and substitute
12	across different platforms.
13	So this would affect the rate that they
14	pay, and also, the sales that they make.
15	BY MR. WOLFSON:
16	Q So in this but-for world that you're
17	talking about, there would be more competition?
18	A So what I'm saying is that based upon what
19	Dr. Schwartz is saying about there being more
20	competition in this but-for world, I'm evaluating
21	his rationale and line of reasoning there.
22	Q In his positive but-for world, he concludes
23	there would be more competition in terms of number
24	of entrants, price competition, and quality
25	competition; right?

	TIUTLY CONFIDENTIAL - ATTURNEYS EYES UNLY
	Page 245
1	A Professor Schwartz claims changes in the
2	but-for world.
3	However, my assignment is about whether or
4	not he can establish classwide impact or damages in
5	that but-for world. I find that he cannot.
6	Q If a but-for world includes more entrants
7	competing, lower prices, higher quality than the
8	real world and the real world exists due to
9	anticompetitive conduct, it's your opinion that
10	that's not classwide anticompetitive impact?
11	MR. CASPER: Object to the form of the
12	question.
13	THE DEPONENT: Yeah. Would you please
14	restate the question?
15	BY MR. WOLFSON:
16	Q If a but-for world includes more entrants
17	competing, lower prices overall, higher quality
18	overall than the real world, and the real world is
19	what it is due to anticompetitive conduct, it's your
20	view that that does not establish classwide impact?
21	MR. CASPER: Same objection.
22	THE DEPONENT: The classwide impact is
23	looking at the publisher's decisions and whether or

not -- and not assuming that there is, as you say, a

common change in price, a common change in quality,

24

Page 246

a common change in innovation.

In this but-for world, platforms would come in and choose different prices -- potentially different prices and different features.

And that ultimately is going to lead publishers, based upon their own preferences, to choose different combinations of platforms, for example. That's going affect their revenue share rate and their sales on a individual basis.

BY MR. WOLFSON:

Q Are you saying that their sales would go down or their costs would go up in this world where

they have more choices?

A In a world where they have more choices, theoretically, there are different prices and different combinations of prices and features, and it's going to change on a publisher-by-publisher level. So whether or not it affects sales, that's an individualized question.

Q Have you identified any category of publishers that you believe would have less sales overall in the but-for world from the elimination of what is alleged to be Valve's anticompetitive conduct?

A What I describe in my report is that the

Page 247

sales depend upon the different pricing, the features, and the sensitivity of consumers.

So that is a question that Dr. Schwartz needs to be able to address on a classwide basis, and I find that he cannot. My assignment is to assess his methodology.

Q My question is: Have you identified any category of publisher that you believe would have less sales in the but-for world?

A So what I'm saying is that publishers' sales in the but-for world are going to -- are going to change. It's going to depend upon the combination of prices and quality.

Q Well, if their sales change by going up, you agree that's a benefit, wouldn't you?

A As to whether or not that's a benefit, it depends upon the trade-off between the prices that they can sell, the quantities they can sell, the revenue share rates they can pay, and also, any of these individualized, for example, exclusive deals with EGS. So that's all part of the but-for world.

Q And my question is: Have you identified any publisher or publishers or category of publishers that you believe would have lower sales in the but-for world?

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY
Page 248
A So what I'm saying is that as far as
identifying the publishers, I'm looking at
Dr. Schwartz's methodology in which he assumed that
all the publishers would have no change in sales.
Q Okay.
A So that's my assignment and my opinion.
Q All right. So the answer is no, you have
not identified any category of publisher that you
think would have lower sales if Valve had to stop
pushing its PMFN in the market; right?
MR. CASPER: Object to the form of the
question.
THE DEPONENT: Would you please be more
specific?
BY MR. WOLFSON:
Q You have not identified any category of
publisher let's just be broader that you
believe would be harmed in the but-for world?
A In fact, what I say is I give examples of
publishers that may actually be worse off in the
but-for world. They would lose, for example, the
exclusive deals with EGS. This is something that
Professor Rietvald also discusses in his report So

Veritext Legal Solutions www.veritext.com

But it's possible that there are publishers

that must be taken into account.

	Page 249
1	that in losing these deals, would be harmed in the
2	but-for world.
3	Q Okay. So so publishers that had
4	exclusives on Epic Games Store, you haven't shown,
5	through any sort of mathematical or other type of
6	analysis, that you believe that they would be harmed
7	in the sense of either making less sales or making
8	less money in the but-for world?
9	A So what I do is I look at examples of this.
10	But, once again, there is not data currently
11	available. It requires individualized inquiry to
12	look at what were the nature of the deals.
13	As I said before, Professor Rietvald
14	himself also says that in a but-for world, these
15	exclusive deals would also go away.
16	Q Okay. Exclusive deals on Epic Games, you
17	hypothesized that there might be some harm to
18	those to those who had exclusive deals on Epic
19	Games; right?
20	A What I
21	MR. CASPER: Object to the form of the
22	question.
23	THE DEPONENT: I'm sorry. Would you please
24	repeat the question?
25	///